

April 13, 1978

LB 713

SENATOR DWORAK: Is that amendment in the Journal?

CLERK: No, sir, it is not.

SENATOR DWORAK: Would you read that amendment one more time please, Pat?

CLERK: Read Dworak amendment.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President, the reason for this amendment is the way the wording reads right now, it is open ended. It says for any offense declared by rule or regulation of the Commission to be a significant offense necessary to be reported to the proper administration of criminal justice. This would.. this is not very definitive, it would almost encompass anything and I think that wording should be struck.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY: The intent, of the language was that the criminal justice department could require that additional repeat offenders under the more serious misdemeanors might.. the department could then require the filing of records of that repeat. I have no great problem with this. I don't think that there is a problem. But, if Senator Dworak feels that it should be removed, so be it. I think very honestly the criminal justice agency should be informed and have information exchanged between them through this criminal records division of those repeat habitual heavy misdemeanor offenders. But, I would say that it is up to the body. If you feel that is too open ended and wish to strike it, I'm not going to belabor the fact. I would just as soon it remained as a tool for these people if they feel that they need it.

SENATOR MILLS PRESIDING

SENATOR MILLS: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Am I closing?

SENATOR MILLS: Senator Chambers, are you wishing to speak or this?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, first of all I want to tell you that this is a very bad bill and Senator Dworak's amendment is an attempt to take away some of the reprehensibility of the bill. In addition to the bad nature of the bill itself, I have to confess to all of you that I made a serious blunder when this bill was on General File. Relying on the credibility of Senator Murphy, I did not object to the bill moving on. But there are some lobbyist's who for hire, who were working behind Senator Murphy and Senator Murphy had nothing to do with them. I believe that Senator Murphy's representations about being willing to work on this bill. But, they had decided already that no amendments, or significant amendments would be adopted. So I have to acknowledge that I was suckered into thinking that there would be a good faith attempt to do something with this bill. A meeting was held in the office of one of the big shot lobbyists

09040